R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 968 UD 004 456

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT OF CONNECTICUT TITLE I PROJECTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966.

BY- ROBY, WALLACE
CONNECTICUT STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, HARTFORD

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.96 72P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, PROBLEMS, PROGRAM COORDINATION, *PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, INNOVATION, EVALUATION METHODS, SCHOOL PERSONNEL, ACTION PROGRAMS (COMMUNITY), STATE AGENCIES, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, BASIC SKILLS, LANGUAGE SKILLS, CHANGING ATTITUDES, TABLES (DATA), STATISTICAL DATA, PRIVATE SCHOOLS, CONNECTICUT, ESEA TITLE 1

THIS EVALUATION BY THE CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT TITLE I PROJECTS CAUTIONS ABOUT MAKING GENERALIZATIONS ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECTS WHICH HAVE BEEN IN OPERATION FOR ONLY A BRIEF PERIOD. THE REPORT NOTES, HOWEVER, THAT SUCH AN EVALUATION CAN BE USEFUL IN ESTABLISHING BASELINE DATA AND PROCEDURES FOR ENSUING YEARS, FOR LEARNING MORE ABOUT THE NEEDS OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH AND TYPES OF APPROPRIATE INTERVENTIONS, AND FOR GATHERING DATA ABOUT PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS. THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT HELPED THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN ADMINISTRATION, DATA DISSEMINATION, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES. A COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POSTTEST GAINS WITH SOME NORM WAS PART OF MOST EVALUATION DESIGNS. THE MAJOR PROBLEMS FOR THE PROJECTS WERE LACK OF SUFFICIENT TIME TO REVIEW PROPOSALS, THE COMPLICATIONS OF THE FUNDING PROVISIONS FOR THE HANDICAPPED, AND THE REDUPLICATION OF EVALUATION BY OUTSIDE AGENCIES. THERE WERE ALSO SOME DIFFICULTIES WITH INAPPROPRIATE PROJECT PROPOSALS, MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT TITLE I ON THE LOCAL LEVEL, AND RELATIONS WITH COMMUNITY ACTION GROUPS. COOPERATION BETWEEN PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND WITH NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS WAS GOOD. INCLUDED IN THE REPORT ARE DATA ON OBJECTIVE MEASURES OF LANGUAGE ACHIEVEMENT AND SECTIONS OF DETAILED COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS AND TABULAR DATA. (NH)

ED015968

F60925 ESEA 04456

Connecticut State Department of Education
Division of Instructional Services
Hartford

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

OF

CONNECTICUT TITLE I* PROJECTS

FOR

FISCAL YEAR 1966

Prepared By: Mr. Wallace Roby
Office of Program Development
Division of Instructional Services
Hartford, Connecticut

AD 004 456

*Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

INTRODUCTION

The data presented by this report was secured from all Connecticut school districts receiving funds under the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Because of the time of year when appropriations and regulations were finalized, many school districts had only brief periods in which to provide direct instructional interventions for children. In some instances, school districts used their initial grants to diagnose the learning disabilities of deprived children and youth; train and secure staff; or "tool up" for a second phase of their project. At the most, Connecticut school districts had eight months to work with their project children, and the period of time for other school districts, can be scaled down to a few weeks.

With limited time, it is quite obvious that generalizations concerning the "effectiveness" or "lack of effectiveness" of Connecticut projects is fraught with danger. This condition would also be true for other states. From a scientific standpoint, the most that can be expected from an evaluation of this initial year of operation with Title I funds would be the following:

(1) The establishment of baseline data and procedures which can be used by school districts to evaluate their Title I projects during the coming years;

(2) Cues concerning the needs of deprived youth and the types of interventions which seem to hold promise for the future; and

(3) statistical data related to the characteristics of Title I programs being initiated.

With an understanding of the limitations of the data being presented, this report is capable of making a contribution to the deprived children and youth of Connecticut by providing preliminary insights into the Title I programs being instituted by the school districts of the State.

PART I

1. OPERATION AND SERVICES

The following statements indicate the steps taken by the Connecticut State Department of Education to provide local school districts with services:

1. Approximately thirty (30) consultants of the Division of Instructional Services of the State Department of Education have been assigned to act as major liaison consultants for all Title I projects approved in Connecticut. These consultants furnish educational expertise and act as the major contact for each participating school district with the State Department of Education.
2. It is estimated that the consultants of the Connecticut State Department of Education have made approximately eight hundred (800) individual field visits to local school districts to provide assistance in the development and operation of Title I projects.
3. Teams of consultants of the State Department of Education have organized and completed twenty (20) regional workshops dealing specifically with Title I programs.

4. Members of the State Department of Education have been utilized as major speakers at one hundred (100) professional and non-professional meetings dealing with Title I.
5. The State Department of Education has prepared several publications specifically aimed at assisting local school districts understand and implement instructional programs for deprived children and youth.

2. DISSEMINATION

(a) Dissemination of Data

The Office of Program Development under the authority of the Director of the Division of Instructional Services has the major responsibility for the acquisition and dissemination of information related to projects for educationally deprived children and the development of effective practices in Connecticut. To compliment the work of the Office of Program Development, cooperating consultants from all bureaus of the State Department of Education as well as special contracts with individuals or institutions are used to provide consultative services to the school districts of Connecticut. This intimate consultative relationship between the State Department of Education and the local school district is expected to be the major vehicle for improving specific Title I programs. Further, the following activities are constantly being utilized to disseminate information and introduce school personnel to promising practices:

1. Publications
2. Conferences
3. Evaluation of Operating Programs
4. Workshops
5. Pilot Programs under the Jurisdiction of the State Department of Education
6. Seminars Conducted by State Department Consultants and Selected University Staff

(b) State Plans for Evaluation

In addition to the means listed in (a) above, it is planned that summaries of different types of projects will be prepared and distributed throughout the state. These summaries will include the evaluation judgments made by the local school districts.

3. EVALUATION

(a) Evaluation Assistance

Recognizing the importance of proper evaluation in the programming for Title I projects, the State Department devoted a major portion of ten (10) initial workshops with school personnel to possible measurement techniques. As further assistance, the State Department of Education prepared a booklet dealing with suggested procedures for the evaluation of Title I projects. This booklet is Attachment A of this report.

Following the initial training sessions dealing with measurement techniques, the prescribed format for the evaluation of Connecticut Title I projects shown as Attachment B, was forwarded to the local school districts. As an outgrowth of this procedure, a group of evaluators from large school systems has been formed which meets monthly

with state department personnel to discuss, suggest, and improve evaluation procedures within our State.

(b) State Personnel Providing Assistance

The following persons have provided the local school districts of Connecticut with significant assistance in the evaluation of Title I programs:

1. Mr. Wallace Roby - Connecticut State Department of Education
2. Dr. James Burke - Connecticut State Department of Education
3. Dr. John Cawley - University of Connecticut, Storrs
4. Dr. John Pappanikou - University of Connecticut, Storrs

(c) Assistance Provided the State

The persons listed in (b) above, have been the major source of evaluation assistance to the State. (The major problem in Connecticut has been to keep groups outside of the state from destroying a good Title I climate through duplicate evaluations and the creation of unnecessary work on the part of the State Office and local school districts.)

(d). Design Levels of Title I projects

The following procedure was used to determine the evaluation designs used for Title I projects during fiscal year 1966:

Step 1. All evaluations of Title I projects were analyzed. Essential data were recorded on tally sheets. The evaluation instrument and/or technique used for each major objective related to changes expected of youth were recorded.

Step 2. All tally sheets were analyzed by an evaluator and categorized according to the highest design level used in evaluating project objectives. An example of a completed tally sheet with design level categorized is shown as Attachment C of this report.

Step 3. Levels of design indicated on each tally sheet were totaled. The results of this step are presented in the table below.

No. of Projects	DESIGN LEVELS OF TITLE I PROJECTS
2	Two group experimental design using the project group and a conveniently available non-project group as the control.
2	One group design using a pretest and posttest on the project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains.
54	One group design using pretest and/or posttest scores on the project group to compare observed performance with local, state, or national groups.
2	One group design using test data on the project group to compare observed performance with expected performance based upon data for past years in the project school.
40	One group design using test data on the project group but no comparison data.
46	Subjective appraisal of general progress.
Other 32	Phase I projects in which no youth were served in the first year.
TOTAL 178	

Findings Related to Evaluation Designs

1. The procedure of pretest and posttest gains compared with some norm was used in 30% of all Title I projects implemented in the first year.

2. The procedure of measuring one group gain without a comparison was used in 22% of all Title I projects.

3. The procedure of subjective appraisal of general progress was used in 2% of all Title I projects.

4. The procedures of two group (experimental and control,) one group pretest and posttest gains compared with expected gains, and one group gains compared with past performance were used for 4% of all Title I projects.

5. No design level was used in 18% of all Title I projects.

Interpretations Related to Evaluation Designs

It would appear that local school districts chose low-level designs to evaluate progress toward Title I objectives. However, design level choices should be considered in relation to the total first year Title I effort. Some limitations are discussed in the following paragraphs:

1. In view of the limited time available to implement Title I projects, the State Department of Education decided not to give undue emphasis to evaluation designs and procedures in the application for approval stage. As important as evaluation is; refinement of this aspect of Title I efforts when other elements had to be quickly developed and implemented seemed unreasonable and beyond the "error of measurement" for first year efforts.

2. Programs conducted in school environments lack the variable controls of laboratory research. Rather than recommend that schools go "all-out" to obtain a control group, it seemed more sensible to encourage schools to use as many indicators as possible from data already available in the schools, i.e., comparing progress of the project group with the most appropriate data available.

3. Considerable knowledge about the characteristics of children and youth who need Title I services has to be collected in order to prejudge "expected gains" of project youth if the second level of evaluation design is to be used. As desirable as this information is, it would have been difficult for most project evaluators to have made great inroads in this direction during the first year. Hopefully, the second level of evaluation design will be used increasingly in succeeding years when more time is available.

4. Most school personnel do not have background experiences in measurement techniques of the scope required for sophisticated

Title I evaluation procedures. For the most part, school efforts have been directed toward determining the progress individuals have made in school subjects. Demands for needs analyses, determination of objectives based on needs, activity descriptions, group data, evaluation instruments related to levels of design, and evaluation in terms of changes found in Title I youth are measurement procedures uncommon to most school personnel. However, a reasonable start has been made and school personnel have shown considerable interest in developing more sophisticated techniques for the evaluation of their Title I projects in the second year.

4. MAJOR PROBLEM AREAS

(a) Major Problems Encountered by the State

1. Reviewing Proposals - During the initial implementation of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, time of appropriations, deadlines, and the finalizing of regulations have made a thorough review of propcsals and depth consultation with local school districts a difficult task. At the time this report was being prepared (December 15, 1966) the specific 1967 entitlements for local school districts were not known. Obviously, the review of proposal revisions or new proposals reflecting accurate entitlements will be accomplished in a crisis situation. The review procedure in Connecticut has an excellent structure which requires consultation with local school districts. The Federal government must set entitlements, regulations, etc., prior to the commencement of the school year if the full potential of a review procedure is to be realized.

2. Operation and Services - The major problem in terms of operation and service is related to P.L. 89-313 which provided funds for

schools serving handicapped children. The procedures used to provide funds for handicapped children in out-of-state institutions appear unduly complex and border on being ridiculous.

3. Evaluation - Our agency has counted seventeen (17) persons, agencies, or committees who have attempted to evaluate Title I programs in Connecticut through a contract or role with the Federal government. If the State Department of Education has the responsibility of evaluating Title I programs, this authority should be discrete or should be delegated to some other agency or group. Repetitious forms, duplication of evaluation efforts, and other like activities have had a harmful effect on Title I programs in the State. This unnecessary duplication makes conscientious evaluation difficult and takes the strength of school personnel which is needed for helping the deprived children and youth in Title I projects.

4. Other - No major problem in this category.

(b) Suggestions or Recommendations for Legislation

The following suggestions represent the thinking related to the problems described in the preceding section of this report:

1. The State Department of Education should have discrete responsibility for the evaluation of Title I programs until it is shown that they are incapable of the task. Other agencies should use the data and procedures developed by state departments if they have unique requirements which need to be satisfied.

2. Appropriations and amendments for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 should be completed by Congress three (3) months prior to the beginning of a school year. Further, it would be helpful if Congress would make long-term appropriations to cover at least a two-year period.
3. Entitlements under P.L. 89-313 should not follow individual children but should be made to the states where the institution is located. In this manner, an institution could deal directly with one state agency rather than being required to deal with several agencies to support a single program designed to help handicapped children.

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 205

(a) Projects Not Approved

In order of prevalence, the types of projects not approved when first submitted were as follows:

1. Projects which did not insure that services were being specifically directed at children who needed compensatory education because of deprived circumstances.
2. Projects which were directed toward securing materials or persons rather than creating specific instructional programs for deprived children and youth.
3. Projects which did not provide appropriate services for deprived children attending non-public schools.

4. Projects which were not clear in the description of the types of programs being planned for deprived children and youth.
5. Projects which did not provide some type of information specified in the state guidelines developed for Title I programs.

(b) Misconceptions of Local Educational Agencies

The following statements represent in order of prevalence the misconceptions of local school districts related to Title I:

1. Because of the vague definition of "educational disadvantaged children and youth" presented by the Federal guidelines, many school districts felt this was a general aid program for the slow learner.
2. Some school districts found it difficult to direct programs toward a limited number of the most seriously deprived children and youth. This misconception is enhanced by the hazy language in the Federal guidelines dealing with size, scope, and quality. In Connecticut, it has been required that school districts concentrate as much as possible on a number of deprived children or youth which is consistent with the number used to determine the entitlements of school districts.
3. Some school districts have felt that the participation of non-public school children depended on the initiative of the non-public school rather than the public school district.

6. COORDINATION OF TITLE I AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

(a) Projects in Community Action Program Areas

Seventy-one projects were initiated by local educational agencies in areas where there were approved community action programs during fiscal year 1966.

(b) Money Granted to LEA in Community Action Areas

A sum total $4,178,377.00 was granted to local educational agencies in areas where there were approved community action programs during fiscal year 1966.

(c) Action Taken to Insure Cooperation

The following procedures are being used by the State Department of Education to coordinate Title I projects with community action programs:

1. The State Commissioner of Education serves on the Advisory Council of the State Office of Economic Opportunity.
2. The State Director of the Connecticut Office of Economic Opportunity serves as an advisor to the Office of Program Development of the Connecticut State Department of Education.
3. A consultant of the State Department of Education has been assigned to assist local school districts and local community action committees develop cooperative working relationships.
4. Copies of programs developed by local school districts to implement the provisions of Title I of P.L. 89-10 are sent to the State Office of Economic Opportunity.

5. Regular monthly meetings are held between the State Department of Education and the State Office of Economic Opportunity. Presently, the State OEO and the State Department of Education are jointly sponsoring ten (10) workshops involving school personnel and community action officials.
6. The Connecticut State Department of Education encourages the use of the "joint check off" form developed by the U.S. Office of Education to provide evidence of cooperation between local school districts and community action groups. The Department is willing, however, to accept a letter from appropriate community action officials indicating that they have been consulted and have been given the opportunity to make appropriate suggestions in the development of the projects presented by local school districts.

(d) Community Action and LEA Cooperation

It is the feeling of the State Department of Education that reasonably good relationships exist between officials of Connecticut school districts and Connecticut community action groups. These relationships are constantly being improved and new contacts between the two groups are being established. General good feeling is our best indication of success.

(e) Problems in Securing Cooperation Between LEA and Community Action Groups

Establishing a dialogue between school personnel and community action groups presents the major problem. It is hoped that joint

workshops presently being held for the two groups will help to establish this dialogue. As school officials and community action officials learn to appreciate the potential of working together for a common purpose, programs for deprived groups will be enhanced. Actually, the climate in Connecticut between LEA and community action officials is quite healthy.

(f) Inter-relationships Between LEA and Community Action Groups

The following statements represent examples of the inter-relationships between Title I projects and OEO programs:

1. Several pre-school programs are jointly funded by Title I and OEO funds.
2. Local educational agencies have used community workers employed by community action programs to involve parents in Title I program activities.
3. There have been a few instances of joint recruiting efforts by local school districts and community action groups.
4. In addition to the pre-school programs, there are several projects in the state which are jointly funded by Title I and OEO monies.

(g) Suggestions for Legislation Concerning Community Action Programs and Title I

Rather than legislation, it seems as though the spirit of cooperation is needed in some areas of the country. Policy or "check off sheets" will not establish good relationships and tend to create

hostility. From the experiences in the State of Connecticut, it appears that state agencies must develop cooperative relationships if it is expected of local communities. It is important that training programs, workshops, seminars, etc., include both groups so that a dialogue of cooperation can be established.

7. INTER-RELATIONSHIPS OF TITLE I WITH OTHER TITLES OF ESEA

Relationships between Title I and other Titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are non-existent in Connecticut. For this reason, it was not possible to complete this section of the guidelines used to develop this report. Although many of the administrative procedures and the school districts are identical, there does not seem to be a natural relationship between the Titles at this time. It needs to be pointed out that most Title III projects in the State of Connecticut are planning grants and future relationships may be developed between Title I and Title III.

At this time, it is difficult to suggest direct inter-relationships between the Titles which might be established through legislation. Of course, instructional materials, innovation centers, research, and strengthening of state departments of education will indirectly affect Title I projects. It seems appropriate at this time to observe the natural relationships which develop between the Titles rather than force relationships through legislative action.

8. COOPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN DISTRICTS

(a) Successes in Cooperative Projects

The obvious indication of success is the fact that many school districts developed cooperative projects and were very comfortable with the arrangement. The following statements show the degree to which Connecticut school districts implemented cooperative projects during fiscal year 1966:

1. A total of 23 towns classified as "E" by the SMSA definitions operated Title I programs. Twelve (12) of these towns combined their entitlements in 4 cooperative projects.

2. A total of 37 towns classified as "D" by SMSA definitions conducted Title I programs. Seven (7) of these towns were involved in 3 cooperative projects.

3. One town classified as "C" by SMSA definitions was involved in a cooperative project.

Because Connecticut has rural supervisory school districts established by legislation, cooperative arrangements for Title I programs in these towns has grown quite naturally. This rural supervisory concept affects 42 towns in 12 rural sections of the State.

Considering first year efforts, cooperative projects have been well planned. Six (6) of the 7 cooperative projects in Connecticut have evaluated first year efforts as having made substantial progress toward serving deprived children and youth.

(b) Problems with Cooperative Projects

The evaluation reports from 2 cooperative projects indicated that the school districts involved had difficulty in securing staff. An additional 2 projects reported that transporting pupils over widely dispersed areas was a problem.

(c) Recommendations for Legislation

(None)

9. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION DURING FISCAL YEAR 1966

(a) Steps that have been or are being taken to encourage initiative of local administrators in contacting non-public school officials.

1. Seven conferences were held with regional superintendents groups and the large city superintendents during November and December of 1966 and 1967 to expedite Title I implementation. At each of these workshops and conferences, non-public school participation was discussed.

2. A total of eleven meetings were held in the fall of 1965 with the Executive Committee of the Association of Public School Superintendents, the superintendents of the Catholic Diocesan Schools, and representatives of the Connecticut Association of Independent Schools in relation to ESEA Title I.

3. State guidelines that have been disseminated to each town state the non-public requirement and suggest services and arrangements that the Law permits.

4. Each project application was required to show the degree or manner of the expected participation by children enrolled in non-public schools. Annual evaluation of all Title I projects required the LEA to indicate the number of non-public school children and youth served, and the arrangement and place that services were rendered.

(b) & (c) Successes and problems that have been experienced in developing and implementing public and non-public school cooperative projects.

1. Approximately 40% of all projects rendered services to non-public youth in the first year.

2. Approximately 15% of all Title I projects during the first year were phase I endeavors in which no youth were served.

3. Approximately 10% of all Title I projects served preschool children where public and non-public children alike were served. Preschool project children have been counted as public school youth in this report.

4. In approximately 20% of all projects, non-public participation in public school projects was sought during the first year, but non-public personnel decided not to participate at the time. Typical examples were after-school help programs, remedial reading during school hours, music broadcasts, out-of-school trips, summer seminars for teachers, and outdoor education projects.

5. Approximately 15% of all projects were unable to locate non-public youth in the district, or found non-public youth unable to meet the criteria related to deprivation. This finding was reported by towns in the C,D, and E classifications with the greatest percentage of occurrence in small towns.

(d) Suggestions or recommendations for revising the legislation concerning public and non-public school participation.

(None)

(e). Number of projects and non-public school children participating by type of arrangement.

Schedule	On Public School Grounds Only		On Non-Public School Grounds Only		On both Public & Non-Public School Grounds		On other than Public or Non-Public Sch.Grounds	
	Proj.	*Chil-dren	Proj.	*Chil-dren	Proj.	*Chil-dren	Proj.	*Children
Regular School Day	11	231	10	1305	1	1	3	134
Before School Day	4	136						
After School	6	93	2	149	1	1	2	25
Weekend	1	6					1	26
Summer	13	102	4	44	6	103	12	607
Regular School Day & Before School								
Regular School Day & After School								
Regular School Day & Weekend								
Regular School Day & Summer								
Before and After School								
After School & Weekend								
After School, Weekend & Summer								
After School & Summer								
Regular Sch. Day, Before Sch. and After School								
Regular Sch. Day, Before Sch. After Sch. Weekend, Summer								
TOTAL	35	568	16	1498	8	105	18	792

*This figure is not expected to be an unduplicated count of children.

10. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

(a) State Guidelines

Guidelines used by the State of Connecticut are enclosed with this report.

(b) Evaluation by Outside Agencies

The Connecticut State Department of Education has not contracted with outside agencies to accomplish the evaluation responsibilities required by Title I. Staff members from the University of Connecticut have been used in a consultative capacity for workshops and other group meetings held in the State.

(c) Compilation of Objective Measurements

The major use of objective measurements as an evaluation device occurred most often in Title I reading programs. These projects were evaluated by many different standarized tests with varying test administration periods. For this reason, common groupings of standardized test results for analysis purposes cannot be given.

To indicate progress of Connecticut children and youth as measured by standardized test results, it was decided to restrict the data presented under this heading to language achievement (reading, vocabulary, spelling, etc.) reported in "grade level equivalents". In this way, comparisons can be made with numbers large enough to be of some significance. It is postulated that the growth in language achievement as measured by "grade level equivalents" would have a high correlation to other subject areas and other statistical devices of measurement such as percentiles.

Objective Measurements of Title I Projects Related to Language Achievement

State Project Number	Grade Level Tested	Number of Pupils	Elapsed Time Between Test Administration	Name of Test, Form	Gain Normally Expected	Interpreted Test Score Gain
SUMMER PROJECTS						
140	1-7	104	1 mo.	Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Test	1 mo.	1 mo. (vocabulary)
131	1-3	34	2 mos.	Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Test	2 mos.	2.4 mos. (vocabulary)
131	1-3	34	2 mos.	Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Test	2 mos.	3.6 mos. (comprehension)
65	2-4	6	2 mos.	Gates Primary Reading, PWR, PSR Gates Advanced Primary Reading, AWR, APR	2 mos.	8.0 mos. (reading)
65	6-9	6	2 mos.	Gates Vocabulary	2 mos.	1.5 mos. (vocabulary)
65	6-9	6	2 mos.	Gates Comprehension	2 mos.	7 mos. (comprehension)
75	3-9	36	2 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills	2 mos.	1 mo. (vocabulary)
75	3-9	36	2 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills	2 mos.	2.5 mos. (comprehension)
153	2-6	12	2 mos.	SRA Language Arts Tests, C,D	2 mos.	5 mos. (language arts)
90	1-8	44	2 mos.	Metropolitan Achievement Test	2 mos.	2 mos. (spelling)
109	2-6	18	2 mos.	Stanford Reading Tests, W, X	2 mos.	5 mos. (reading)
159	7-8	40	2 mos.	Gilmore Oral Reading Test	2 mos.	1 mo. (reading)
40	3-9	31	2 mos.	Metropolitan Achievement Test	2 mos.	3 mos. (reading)

State Project Number	Grade Level Tested	Number of Pupils	Elapsed Time Between Test Administration	Name of Test, Form	Gain Normally Expected	Interpreted Test Score Gain
SUMMER PROJECTS						
40	3-9	31	2 mos.	Metropolitan Achievement Test	2 mos.	4 mos. (wd. knowledge)
207	4-8	33	2 mos.	Gilmore Oral Reading	2 mos.	2 mos. (read. skill)
151	4-6	23	1 mo.	Metropolitan Achievement Test	1 mo.	3 mos.(wd. recognition)
207	4-8	33	2 mos.	Gilmore Oral Reading	2 mos.	1 mo. (comprehension)
SCHOOL YEAR PROJECTS						
6	7	23	7 mos.	Iowa All-Pupil Test of Educational Achievement	7 mos.	8 mos.(reading comprehension)
6	8	34	7 mos.	Iowa All-Pupil Test of Educational Achievement	7 mos.	6 mos. (reading comprehension)
26	1-3	28	4 mos.	Gates Primary Reading Test and Gates Advanced Primary Reading Test	4 mos.	4 mos. (reading)
34	2	46	7 mos.	Gates Reading Test	7 mos.	7.5 mos. (reading)
34	3	59	7 mos.	Gates Reading Test	7 mos.	5 mos. (reading)
34	4	25	7 mos.	Gates Reading Test	7 mos.	7.5 mos. (reading)
34	5	25	7 mos.	Gates Reading Test	7 mos.	7.5 mos. (reading)
44	6	40	8 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills	8 mos.	13 mos.(vocabulary & comprehension)

State Project Number	Grade Level Tested	Number of Pupils	Elapsed Time Between Test Administration	Name of Test, Form	Gain Normally Expected	Interpreted Test Score Gain
SCHOOL YEAR PROJECTS						
4	2	10	5 mos.	Gates Primary Reading Test	5 mos.	5 mos. (reading)
4	3	5	5 mos.	Gates Advanced Primary Reading Test	5 mos.	8 mos. (reading)
4	4-6	29	5 mos.	Gates Basic Reading Test	5 mos.	7 mos. (reading)
4	6-8	26	5 mos.	Iowa Silent Reading Test	.5 yr.	1 yr. (reading)
81	7	20	6 mos.	Stanford Achievement Test, X	6 mos.	15 mos.(paragraph mean.)
81	7	20	6 mos.	Stanford Achievement Test, X	6 mos.	10 mos. (spelling)
81	7	20	6 mos.	Stanford Achievement Test, X	6 mos.	7 mos. (language)
81	8	19	6 mos.	Stanford Achievement Test, X	6 mos.	13 mos.(paragraph mean)
81	8	19	6 mos.	Stanford Achievement Test, X	6 mos.	7 mos. (spelling)
81	8	19	6 mos.	Stanford Achievement Test, X	6 mos.	6 mos.(language)
51	3	62	8 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 3, 4, 1	.8 yr	1.1 yrs.(vocabulary)
51	3	62	8 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 3, 4, 1	.8 yr	1.2 yrs. (reading)
51	4	56	8 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills,3,4,1	.8 yr	1.1 yrs.(vocabulary)
51	4	56	8 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 3, 4, 1	.8 yr	.8 yr. (reading)

State Project Number	Grade Level Tested	Number of Pupils	Elapsed Time Between Test Administration	Name of Test, Form	Gain Normally Expected	Interpreted Test Score Gain
SCHOOL YEAR PROJECTS						
51	5	49	8 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 3, 4, 1	.8 yr.	1.0 yr. (vocabulary)
51	5	49	8 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 3, 4, 1	.8 yr.	1.2 yrs. (reading)
51	6	44	8 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 3, 4, 1	.8 yr.	1.0 yr. (vocabulary)
51	6	44	8 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 3, 4, 1	.8 yr.	0.4 yr. (reading)
51	7	25	8 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 3, 4, 1	.8 yr.	0.6 yr. (vocabulary)
51	7	25	8 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 3, 4, 1	.8 yr.	0.6 yr. (reading)
51	8	19	8 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. 3, 4, 1	.8 yr.	0.9 yr. (vocabulary)
51	8	19	8 mos.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, 3, 4, 1	.8 yr.	0.8 yr. (reading)
7	5	5	3 mos.	Gates Reading Survey	3 mos.	7 mos. (comprehension)
7	6	10	3 mos.	Gates Reading Survey	3 mos.	8 mos. (comprehension)
17	1-3	86	6 mos.	SRA Reading	6 mos.	6 mos.
30	3-6	34	5 mos.	American School Achievement Tests, E	5 mos.	3 mos.

State Project Number	Grade Level Tested	Number of Pupils	Elapsed Time Between Test Administration	Name of Test, Form	Gain Normally Expected	Interpreted Test Score Gain
SCHOOL YEAR PROJECTS						
1	1	30	7 mos.	Metropolitan Achievement Test	7 mos.	6 mos. (reading)
1	2	22	7 mos.	Metropolitan Achievement Test	7 mos.	5 mos. (reading)
1	3	31	7 mos.	Metropolitan Achievement Test	7 mos.	6 mos. (reading)
1	4	34	7 mos.	Metropolitan Achievement Test	7 mos.	6 mos. (reading)
31	4	50	5 mos.	Gilmore Oral Reading Test, A, B	.5 yr.	1.5 yrs.(reading)

Findings Related To Language Achievement As Determined By Objective Measurements

In order to provide for a means of comparing standardized test results, the information in this section of the report is based on measurements of projects which were described as "grade level equivalents". If percentiles, raw scores, or some other statistical means were used to describe progress, they were not included in these data. This procedure seems justified on a sampling basis (all tests reported in grade equivalents) as the results of 56 groupings of Title I children and youth involved in 22 Connecticut projects form the data on which these findings are based. Because of the relatively substantial number of projects (22) reported in this section, it is logical to assume that these findings indicate a statewide picture. The findings are:

1. Approximately 45% of the grouped test score results indicate achievement gains beyond that normally expected for youth as compared to norms given in standardized tests.

2. Approximately 40% of the grouped test score results indicate achievement gains normally expected of youth as compared to norms given in standardized tests.

3. Approximately 15% of the grouped test score results indicate achievement gains less than that normally expected of youth as compared to norms given in standardized tests.

4. According to standardized test results, pupils in 40% of the summer Title I projects showed a mean growth in language achievement of at least twice as much as that normally expected as compared to test norms related to the time span of the project.

5. According to standardized test results, pupils in 20% of the regular school year Title I projects showed a mean growth in language achievement of at least twice as much as that normally expected as compared to test norms related to the time span of the project.

Interpretation of Findings Related To Language Achievement As Determined by Objective Measurements

The following statements represent an interpretation of the data presented in this section of the report:

1. Standardized tests indicate that Title I projects have been successful in providing language skills (reading, spelling, etc.) to the vast majority of children and youth in projects developed for this purpose.

2. Standardized test results indicate that summer Title I projects have been successful in providing language skills (reading, spelling, etc.) to the vast majority of children and youth in projects developed for this purpose.

(d) Sample of Approved Projects in Fiscal 1966

A 10% sample of approved fiscal 1966 projects are enclosed with this report.

PART II COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

1. STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Town Classification	No. of towns in State in This classification	No. of towns without Title I entitlements	No. of Projects	No. of LEA's for which Title I programs have been approved	Funds Actually Committed	Unduplicated count of children Total Col. 5,6 &7	Public*	Non Public	Not** Enrolled	Average cost per pupil col. 3 by col.4
(1)	(1a)	(1b)	(1c)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
A	11	0	40	11	$3,477,042	33,595	31,152	2,077	366	$103.
B	2	0	5	2	130,148	562	493	54	15	232.
C	69	3	56	48	916,751	5,294	4,701	305	288	173.
D	50	1	44	37	545,931	4,518	3,992	351	175	121.
E	37	7	16	23	114,178	740	739	1	0	154.
TOTAL	169	11	161	121	$5,184,050	44,709	41,077	2,788	844	116.
Schools for Handicapped Children			17	(handicapped schools) 12	360,736	1,146	458		(non-grad.) 688	315

* Pre-school youth have been counted as public school children.
** Dropouts and non-graded children and youth have been categorized as "Not Enrolled".

2. ESTABLISHING PROJECT AREAS

In view of the small numbers involved and the consistency of the indices used by all local school districts, this section of the report is presented without consideration of the SMSA town classification.

The following represents, in rank order, the most widely used methods for establishing project areas in the local school districts of Connecticut:

Rank	Method of Determing Project Areas
1.	Welfare Data (Includes ADC cases)
2.	Characteristics of Parents
3.	Broken Homes
4.	Minority Group Statistics
5.	Teacher or Nurse Judg ments of Home Conditions
6.	Employment Statistics
7.	Health Statistics
8.	Housing Statistics
9.	Free Lunches
10.	Census Data (Income)

3. NEEDS OF DEPRIVED CHILDREN & YOUTH

As with the section dealing with the methods used to determine project areas, a breakdown in terms of the SMSA classification of towns is not provided because of the small numbers involved and the consistency of responses by all sizes of school districts.

The most pressing needs of deprived children and youth as provided by Connecticut school districts are given below in rank order:

Rank	Description of Need
1.	Better achievement in basic subjects
2.	A greater interest in school
3.	Reasons for better conduct, reduced truancy, and staying in school
4.	A better attitude toward school and community
5.	Increased Motivation

4. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROBLEMS

The following procedures were used to determine the problems encountered by local school districts in implementing Title I projects during fiscal year 1966:

1. All summary annual evaluations received from local school districts were analyzed to determine their responses to: "Describe the least successful activities or components of the project. List any problems that were encountered in implementing and/or operating the project."

2. All evaluations were analyzed and recorded on a tally sheet which was a short abstract of essential information.

3. All responses listed on tally sheets were categorized. A total of 136 responses were summarized from 162 tally sheets, and percentages were calculated.

4. A compilation of findings was prepared for each town classification.

5. Interpretations were made from the findings.

Problems Encountered By the Largest Towns
(SMSA Classification A)

1. Lack of personnel accounted for 15% of the responses given by the largest towns. The personnel sought in rank order of needs were: Social workers, speech and hearing specialists, psychological examiners, reading teachers, teachers for classes of non-English speaking children and youth, and elementary teachers.

2. Interstaff communication accounted for 15% of the responses given by the largest towns. Typical of these problems were: Rescheduling the total school staff into groups; sometimes teachers did not know of the availability of services; teachers complained about children missing their regular classes too often.

3. School-home communications accounted for 15% of the responses given by the largest towns. Typical of these problems were: Very few parents attended the conferences; it was difficult to get mothers for preschool activities.

4. Least successful project elements accounted for 15% of the responses made by large towns. Typical elements were: too many field trips; getting dropouts to come back for an after-school machine shop offering; class periods of remedial services were scheduled for too long an increment of time; attendance was erratic.

5. Lack of space accounted for 10% of the responses given by large towns.

6. Slow deliveries of materials, equipment, and supplies accounted for 10% of the responses given by large towns.

7. Lack of time, untimely start, or project services too short accounted for 10% of the responses given by large towns.

8. Other problems or responses not recorded accounted for 10% of the responses given by large towns.

Problems Encountered by Secondary Towns
(SMSA Classification B)

1. The principal responses described by two secondary towns conducting five projects were: Difficulty in hiring staff in the middle of the year, and late arrival of equipment and materials.

Problems Encountered by Medium Sized Towns in Core City Areas (SMSA Classification C)

1. Least successful project elements accounted for 30% of all responses given by medium sized towns in core city areas. Typical comments were: Testing done too extensively; high rate of absenteeism; augmenting reading skills by simply using books; poor attendance at evening library sessions; just attending movies.

2. School-home communications accounted for 15% of the responses given by medium sized towns in core city areas. Typical comments were: Difficult to find bilingual aides from among parents; it was a problem getting parents to participate.

3. Lack of time accounted for 15% of all responses given by medium sized towns in core city areas.

4. Lack of personnel, scheduling, space, inadequate materials or equipment and transportation accounted for 15% of all responses given by medium sized towns in core city areas.

5. Other problems and no comments recorded accounted for 25% of all responses given by medium sized towns in core city areas.

Problems Encountered By Medium Sized Towns Outside Core City Areas (SMSA Classification D)

1. Least successful program elements accounted for 25% of all responses given by medium sized towns outside core city areas. Typical comments were: Getting children to read books for recreational purposes; after school study efforts were dropped because of lack of interest; placing junior high school youth with elementary youth in summer school.

2. Lack of time accounted for 10% of all responses given by medium sized towns outside core city areas.

3. Lack of personnel accounted for 10%

4. Interstaff communication accounted for 10%

5. School home communication accounted for 10%

6. Inadequate equipment, transportation and interstaff communication accounted for 10%

7. Other problems and no response recorded accounted for 25%

Problems Encountered by Small Towns
(SMSA Classification E)

1. Least successful program elements accounted for 25% of all responses given by small towns. Typical comments were: test drill exercises were relatively unsuccessful; traditional phonics analysis procedures not appropriate; creativity exercises planned were unsuccessful.

2. Interstaff communication accounted for 15%

3. School-home communications accounted for 15%

4. Other problems and no comments recorded accounted for 45% of all responses given by small towns.

Findings Related to Problems Encountered In Implementing Title I Projects

The following is a summary of the findings related to problems as reported by all Connecticut school districts:

1. The problem most frequently reported by school districts dealt with school-home communications. (Of the 263 responses evaluated, 32 mentioned that establishing relationships with homes of deprived children was a problem.)

2. Lack of personnel was reported as a problem of major importance. (Of the 263 responses reported, 30 mentioned that securing staff was a serious problem.)

3. Lack of time to plan and implement Title I projects was a problem reported quite frequently by local school districts. (Of the 263 responses evaluated, 23 reported mentioned that insufficient time for planning and implementation was a problem.)

4. When school districts were asked to list the least successful activities instituted through Title I funds, 67 of 263 total responses indicated that inappropriate instructional interventions accounted for the least successful part of the projects initiated in Connecticut. These inappropriate interventions were mainly described as "typical classroom instruction" or "afternoon and evening academic endeavors."

Interpretation of Findings Related to Problems Encountered in Implementing Title I Programs

The information compiled from local school districts concerning least successful activities and problems encountered indicates the following:

1. Least successful program elements are the greatest source of problems or create the feeling of restricted success on the part of school personnel. There is evidence from these responses that if the intervention is similar to a typical classroom approach or if it is an afternoon or evening academic endeavor, the possibility of problems is increased and it can become the least successful of the interventions being initiated.

2. Many evaluators of Title I projects feel that the establishment of communications between the home and the school is a problem of importance. This situation suggests the need of establishing a more effective means of involving parents of children receiving Title I services in appropriate school activities.

3. The fact that Title I funds were made available to local school districts during the middle of a school year created some problems and restricted the effectiveness of programs for deprived children and youth.

4. Schools for handicapped children receiving funds under P.L. 89-313 felt that State procedures related to the establishment of positions was the most prevalent problem. Through delays caused by the time of year when the appropriations were made and the clearance of positions through State procedures, the securing of staff for Title I programs was extremely difficult.

5. PREVALENT ACTIVITIES

The following major activities of Title I programs are listed in the following paragraphs by rank order of prevalence for the five classifications of Connecticut towns and schools for handicapped children.

Prevalance of activities was determined through an analysis of the number and type of all major activities, services, or arrangements for all towns with Title I projects according to Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area classifications.

I. A Towns (11 largest core cities)

1. Reading and language arts activities accounted for 15% of all activities, services and arrangements.

2. Large expenditures for materials and equipment accounted for 15% of all activities, services, or arrangements.

3. Other accounted for 15% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

4. Reduction of the pupil-teacher ratio by adding staff accounted for 10% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

5. Teacher oriented services (workshops, curriculum development, teacher training, etc.) accounted for 10% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

6. Creative arts accounted for 10% of all activities, services, or arrangements.

7. Facility preparation, use of teacher aides, cultural trips, ancillary services, and preschool programs each accounted for 5% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

II. B Towns (2 secondary cities)

1. Basic subject study, use of teacher aides, equipment purchases, and other each accounted for 25% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

III. C Towns (69 towns under 50,000 in the core city area)

1. Reading and language arts accounted for 25% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

2. Arithmetic accounted for 15% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

3. Preschool programs, basic subjects, ancillary services, use of teacher aides, creative arts, and other each accounted for 10% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

IV. D Towns (50 towns under 50,000 outside the core city area)

1. Reading and language arts accounted for 25% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

2. Other accounted for 30% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

3. Basic subjects accounted for 15% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

4. Large equipment and material purchases accounted for 10% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

5. Preschool program, health, use of teacher aide, and diagnostic procedures each accounted for 5% each of all activities, services, and arrangements.

V. E Towns (37 towns under 2,500)

1. Reading accounted for 30% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

2. Other accounted for 30% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

3. Preschool programs, basic subjects, diagnostic procedures, and ancillary services, each accounted for 10% of all activities, services and arrangements.

VI. Schools for Handicapped Children

1. Equipment and supply purchases; teacher training and curriculum development; and basic instructional help for children accounted for 50% of the Title I activities.

2. Recreational programs, physical therapy, trips, self-help services, renovation of facilities, creative arts, typing, and diagnostic services accounted for 50% of the Title I activities.

Findings Related to Prevalent Activities

The following statements are the major findings related to the prevalent activities carried on by Connecticut school districts through

the use of Title I funds during fiscal year 1966:

1. Numerous <u>other</u> activities, services, and arrangements not carried out extensively in Title I programs account for 40% of the total.

2. <u>Reading</u> accounted for 20% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

3. <u>Basic subjects</u>, and <u>large purchases of materials and equipment</u> each accounted for 10% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

4. <u>Preschool programs</u>, <u>teacher orientation</u>; <u>use of teacher aides</u> and <u>creative arts</u> each accounted for 5% of all activities, services, and arrangements.

5. Schools serving handicapped children used a large amount of their funds under P.L. 89-313 to "tool up" for programs involving children during the second year of funding. In addition, these schools gave considerable emphasis to summer school or camping experiences.

6. INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

Activities of the following projects represent new approaches for the five classifications of towns and State supported schools for handicapped children. The intent of this section is not to select the "best project" activities in the State, but to describe the breadth of emphases represented in each classification.

I. A TOWNS (the 11 largest core cities)

<u>State Project No.</u>

An abandoned amusement park on the ocean shoreline was turned into a summer creative arts camp by one large core city. A public beach convention hall was remodeled into craft studios, painting and woodworking areas, and music practice rooms. Professional drama persons offered creative dance lessons and encouraged children in small play productions. Cookouts, ocean swimming, trips, and physical fitness were other typical activities enjoyed by 405 children from

grades 3 through 8. Youthful instrumental musicians publicized their presence with daily renditions of popular songs.

State Project No.

One part of a public school component of a core city project involved English language help for 75 foreign born youth ranging in age from 6 to 14 years. Twenty-five new foreign born entrants came into the elementary school during the short three month period of project services. The two teachers staffing the project point to this statistic as reason enough for their flexibility in programming. Teachers instructing these youth in other classes rated highly the additional English language help.

State Project No.

College students were recruited to meet with small groups of youth after school hours. Programs of mutual interest were arranged. In a few instances, tutoring was the main concern. Sometimes groups just talked. Most often, groups went about town together to places such as bowling alleys, skating in the park, airport sightseeing, T.V. studios, museums, and other places. A total of 260 youth from grades 1 to 8 participated in this program for 25 weeks.

State Project No.

The role of an elementary school was modified to serve as a center for three schools during after school hours. School help was given and recreational programs were made available for elementary and junior high school students. Piano and instrumental instruction and practice were available; an arts and crafts area was opened; listening centers were equipped with record player and records; tutorial services were given for children of grades 5,6,7, and 8; gymnastics for boys and modern dance for girls; story hours and books were available from the library; and trips were taken during the week and on Saturdays. Parents from the neighborhood were recruited to chaperone and serve as leaders.

II. B TOWNS (2 secondary cities with population over 50,000)

State Project No.

Students who seldom did homework started doing homework when four teachers and six high school students tutored 30 junior high youth for eight weeks during the past school year. The library served as the study center during after school hours.

III. C TOWNS (47 towns under 50,000 within core city areas)

State Project No.

A Spanish-speaking aide assisted a teacher in helping Puerto Rican children learn English prior to school entrance. Communication skills were taught by the teacher in a classroom setting. Field trips were taken. Art, music, and drama were part of the program. Parental school visits were encouraged and the staff visited homes of the children.

State Project No.

For 153 middle grade youth, science classes back in the school setting will never be quite the same again. Property with unusual terrain features, waterfront, and recreational facilities was rented for the purpose of sponsoring a summer science and physical fitness camp. Walking, swimming, climbing, digging,seining, collecting, and mounting best describe a typical camp day. A youth missing the camp bus one morning walked the distance to camp. He arrived in time for lunch!

State Project No.

To increase reading achievement, the designer of this project picked activities that excited youth to show greater interest in school. Fifty-seven middle grade and junior high school youth engaged in after-school endeavors of model-making, knitting, art work, drama, craft work, games, and trips. Actually, direct reading help was rendered with the aid of filmstrips, library work, and reading machines. The staff and the parents judged this program helpful in raising children's reading achievement.

IV D TOWNS (37 towns outside core city areas with populations between 2,500 and 49,999)

State Project No.

Fifty-eight primary and middle grade youth from a rural community spent the last semester of their school year with teacher aides in the classrooms and received the services of a speech therapist. Aides did more than routine tasks. Screened off sections of the rooms provided places for them to work with one to three children in an effort to improve children's oral language skills. Regular staff worked with the aides and judged the services as a morale booster and a help to their improved school achievement. The speech therapist worked with twenty-nine of the children with linguistic handicaps and advised teachers of ways to help children with speech problems in the classroom.

State Project No.__

Better end-of-year subject grades resulted from expanded curriculum services for 39 seventh and eighth grade youth. Additional supplies and equipment were obtained for teaching combination classes of science-math and language arts-social studies. A counselor's services were obtained; after school studying was arranged; trips were taken related to class study; and parents were recruited to help... particularly on extended trips. Results of two administrations of a standardized achievement test over a six month period found project youth surpassing the total seventh and eighth grade school population test score gains in almost all categories tested.

State Project No.__

A language arts specialist operated one day center and aides, under the supervision of regular staff, ran four others in providing services for 454 elementary youth in five school areas. Children and youth received from two to six hours of direct help weekly according to need. Services were rendered for approximately three months during the school year and for seven weeks during the summer. Future plans propose to place mobile reading centers in the heart of community areas most in need for full time operation during summer months.

V. E TOWNS (towns under 2,500 population away from core cities)

State Project No.__

A clinical team made up of a psychologist, reading specialist and social worker from a nearby university worked with four rural towns in a project designed to improve school achievement in reading skills. Extensive diagnostic testing was done. Homes were visited. Regular staff and clinic staff reviewed findings and began a reading skills program during after school hours for 102 elementary children. Results of fourteen weeks of services indicated significant test score gains in reading skills for project youth compared to control group gains made on pre and post administrations of one standardized achievement test and a locally made test.

State Project No.__

A cooperative project carried out during the school year and summer for 50 fourth grade students from three towns coordinated field trips with the classroom study of state history. Children were judged to have made substantial gains in reading achievement over the twenty week period as indicated by the pre and post administration of a reading test.

VI. 89-313 SCHOOLS (12 schools for handicapped children)

State Project No.__

Eighty-five mentally retarded youth were given physical fitness training for eight weeks during the summer. Analysis of individual and group participation indicated activities involving strength and coordination which mentally retarded youth could perform.

State Project No.__

A four week summer school program including Braille instruction, typing, independent travel help, physical therapy, swimming, and field trips was given to 22 blind children from grades 6 through 12. Most progress was made in typing and independent travel help.

State Project No.__

A director, clinical psychologist, and two aides helped eight severely retarded children improve in self-care skills such as toilet training, self feeding, drinking, washing, and social interaction. Half of the children made substantial progress in the twelve week period resulting from training four hours daily. Lack of systematic help of parents on weekends caused Monday morning setbacks, so the staff is in the process of producing end-of-week and beginning-of-week movies to show parents the effect of weekends at home.

State Project No.__

Two hundred and fifty retarded children experienced a summer recreational-nature-creative arts experience for nine weeks. Children strolled the ocean beaches and collected shells with a nature specialist; fingerpainted with the arts and crafts teacher; made flutes and bow-string harps with a musician; and fed squirrels and ate wild raspberries during nature excursions.

7. METHODS OF INCREASING STAFF FOR TITLE I PROJECTS DURING FISCAL YEAR 1966

The following procedures were used to determine the methods used by

local school districts to secure staff for Title I projects:

Step 1. All summary annual evaluations for all towns were analyzed to determine responses to: "List the procedures employed to develop or increase professional staff required to provide project services".

Step 2. All evaluations were analyzed and recorded on a tally sheet which is a short abstract of essential data.

Step 3. All responses listed on the tally sheets were categorized. A total of 178 responses were summarized from 162 tally sheets and percentages were calculated.

Step 4. A compilation of finding were prepared for each town classification.

Step 5. Interpretation of the findings were made..

Findings Related to Staff Procurement for "A" Towns

1. Large cities principally used regular staff in the summer for staffing Title I projects during fiscal year 1966. This procedure accounted for 25% of the methods used.

2. Paid teacher aides, community adults or liaison persons accounted for 20% of methods used to staff Title I programs during fiscal year 1966.

3. Obtaining new full time staff accounted for 20% of the methods used to staff Title I programs during fiscal year 1966.

4. Unpaid community volunteers accounted for 10% of the methods used to staff Title I programs during fiscal year 1966.

5. Specific information about staff was not obtained in 25% of the evaluations submitted.

Findings Related to Staff Procurement for "B" Towns

1. Regular staff used during the summer, regular staff used after school hours, and paid teacher aides accounted for more than three-quarters of the methods used by local school districts in this classification to secure staff for Title I programs.

Findings Related to Staff Procurement for "C" Towns

1. The principal method used in C towns for staffing Title I projects was regular staff used during the summer. This procedure accounted for 30% of all methods used to increase Title I staff.

2. Paid teacher aides, community adults or liaison persons accounted for 20% of all methods used to increase Title I staff.

3. New full time staff accounted for 15% of all methods used to increase Title I staff.

4. Regular staff assigned full time (replaced in the system), regular staff used after school hours, and new part time staff obtained each accounted for 10% of all methods used to increase Title I staff.

5. Specific information about staff was not obtained in 5% of the evaluations submitted.

Findings Related to Staff Procurement for "D" Towns

1. The principal method used by D towns to increase staff was use of regular staff during the summer. This procedure accounted for 30% of the methods used to secure Title I staff.

2. Paid teacher aides or community adults accounted for 20% of all methods used to secure Title I staff.

3. New full time staff obtained accounted for 15% of all methods used to secure Title I staff.

4. Regular staff full time assignment (replaced in the system) and regular staff used during after school hours each accounted for 10% of all methods used to secure Title I staff.

5. Specific information about staff was not obtained in 15% of the evaluations submitted.

Findings Related to Staff Procurement for "E" Towns

1. Regular staff used during the summer accounted for 35% of the methods used for increasing staff.

2. Regular staff used during after school hours accounted for 30% of all methods used for increasing staff.

3. Specific information about increasing staff was not obtained for 35% of the evaluations submitted.

Findings for Schools for Handicapped Children

1. Regular staff used during the summer and new part time staff were the two principal methods used to increase staff in the schools for handicapped children.

Findings Related to Staff Procurement for All Towns

1. Regular staff used during the summer accounted for 25% of all methods used to staff Title I programs during fiscal year 1966.

2. New full time staff obtained accounted for 20% of all methods used to staff Title I programs during fiscal year 1966.

3. Paid teacher aides, community adults or liaison persons accounted for 15% of all methods used to staff Title I programs during fiscal year 1966.

4. New part time staff obtained accounted for 10% of all methods used to staff Title I programs during fiscal year 1966.

5. Regular staff taking program assignment (being replaced by new personnel) and regular staff used during after-school hours accounted for a combined 15% of all methods used to staff Title I programs during fiscal year 1966.

6. Unpaid community volunteers and other arrangements accounted for the combined 15% of all methods used to increase staff for Title I programs during fiscal year 1966.

Interpretation of Findings Related to the Procurement of Staff for Title I Projects

The following statements represent an interpretation of the findings related to the methods used by local school districts to secure staff for

Title I projects:

1. Using regular staff for summer programs was the major means used by local school districts in all classifications for staffing Title I projects. Quite likely this condition will change during coming years when school districts will have sufficient time to plan and implement additional "year-long" Title I projects. It appears that many school districts felt that an initial summer project was more feasible in view of the inappropriate time of the year when funds were available and regulations for Title I were finalized.

2. Teacher aides and community adults were used principally in largest and middle size towns while small towns (comprising 20% of all projects) seldom used non-professional persons to staff programs.

3. There is evidence that Connecticut school districts have been able to recruit a considerable number of new full-time and part-time teachers for Title I projects. The source of these teachers is not known, but checking with selected school districts indicate the following:

    a. Some teachers can be attracted by the social commitment to deprived children and youth.

    b. Some teachers can take part-time positions if convenient hours can be arranged.

    c. Some teachers have been attracted from out-of-state.

    d. Some teachers have completed their professional training during the school year.

4. The Title I staffing methods used by schools offering programs for handicapped children had too many limitations in the first year to consider a study of staffing patterns. Personnel from schools for handicapped were severely limited in time and hindered in establishing State positions even after staff had been located.

8. MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

The following procedures were used to determine the most prevalently used instruments for grade levels" Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten,

Grades 1-3, Grades 4-6, Grades 7-9, and Grades 10-12:

1. Annual evaluations of all Title I programs were analyzed to determine responses to questions about instruments used. Specific questions asked can be found in Part II of the evaluation format distributed by the State, Pages 3 and 4 of Attachment B.

2. Essential data about each project were recorded on a tally sheet. A completed tally sheet can be found in Attachment C.

3. Tally sheets for all projects were sorted in terms of the size of the school district (SMSA Classifications.)

4. Information from tally sheets was categorized by grade level classifications.

5. Instruments most prevalently used to evaluate Title I programs were identified.

Findings Related To Most Prevalently Used Measuring Instruments

The instruments most prevalently used to determine progress toward Title I program objectives have been given below by SMSA town classifications and by grade level categories. Instruments used have been listed in rank order of occurrence.

1. A TOWNS (40 projects of 11 core cities)

Pre K and K: Anecdotal records, ratings by teachers and parents, and subjective appraisal.

Grades 1-3: Rating by teachers, subjective appraisal, achievement tests, and teacher-kept achievement records. No predominant achievement test was used.

Grades 4-6: Subjective appraisal and ratings by teachers.

Grades 7-9: Ratings by teachers and evaluators and subjective appraisal.

Grades 10-12: Subjective appraisals

2. B TOWNS (5 projects from 2 secondary cities of over 50,000)

Pre K and K: Subjective appraisals.

Grades 1-3: Subjective appraisals and IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, Forms 3,4,1. (IOWA TESTS used in one project)

Grades 4-6: Subjective appraisals and IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, Forms 3,4,1. (IOWA TESTS used in one project)

Grades 7-9: Appraisals by teachers and student tutors, and IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, Forms 3,4,1. (IOWA TESTS used in one project)

Grades 10-12: Subjective appraisals

3. C TOWNS (56 projects from 48 towns in core city area with population less than 50,000)

Pre K and K: Subjective appraisals

Grades 1-3: 50% of all instruments used were achievement tests; questionnaires, and subjective appraisals. Of approximately 15 achievement tests (administered pre and post), IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS were used in 4 projects.

Grades 4-6: 50% of all instruments used were achievement tests; subjective appraisals and questionnaires answered by teachers. Of approximately 18 achievement tests (administered pre and post), IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS were used in 4 projects.

Grades 7-9: 50% of all instruments used were achievement tests; subjective appraisals and subject achievement records kept by teachers.

Grades 10-12: Subjective appraisals.

4. D TOWNS (44 projects from 37 towns outside core city areas and under 50,000 population)

Pre K and K: Subjective appraisals and anecdotal records.

Grades 1-3: 60% of all instruments used were achievement tests, subjective appraisals, and teacher ratings. Of approximately 20 achievement tests (administered pre and post) the METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST was used in 4 projects.

Grades 4-6: 60% of all instruments used were achievement tests, subjective appraisals, and progress in subject achievement kept by teachers. Of approximately 25 achievement tests (administered pre and post) the METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST was used in 4 projects.

Grades 7-9: Achievement tests accounted for 50% of all instruments used; subjective appraisals, and questionnaires answered by teachers. No one achievement test was used most often.

Grades 1012: Only 2 projects served this grade level, and subjective appraisals were given for both.

5. E TOWNS (16 projects from 23 towns with population under 2,500)

Pre K and K: Of 4 projects serving this grade classification no predominant measures were found (teacher reports, projective techniques, and teacher judgment).

Grades 1-3: Achievement tests, questionnaires, and subjective appraisals. No one achievement test was used most often.

Grades 4-6: 50% of all instruments used were achievement tests. Of 7 tests that were pre and post tested, 3 were the METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST.

Grades 7-9: Achievement tests were predominant. The METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST accounted for 2 of the 3 tests administered in the few projects serving grades 7-9.

Grades 10-12: No projects served this grade level of youth.

Interpretation of Findings Related to the Instruments Used to Evaluate Title I Projects

The following statements are an interpretation of the findings related to the instruments used to evaluate Title I projects during fiscal year 1966:

1. During this initial year of operation of Title I programs, the large cities used rating scales and questionnaires completed by teachers, and subjective appraisals of program success as the major means of evaluating the effectiveness of their projects. Conversely, the smaller school districts used achievement tests as the major means to measure attainment toward project objectives.

2. Connecticut towns using achievement tests as an evaluation instrument vary widely in their specific choices of tests.

3. Many school districts planning to use a pre-test and post-test analysis to evaluate their Title I projects, abandoned the procedure when it became obvious that the period of time during which the program operated was too short for a valid comparison.

4. There is little use by school districts of environment indicators such as promotion rates, attendance rates, dropout rates, subject grades, etc. as means of evaluating the effectiveness of Title I programs.

9. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVE ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

(a) (b) The following State of Connecticut Title I program activities have been judged most effective for the grade levels given below for town classifications.

(1). Early years (Pre-school through Grade 3)

(2). Middle years (Grade 4 through Grade 6)

(3). Teen Years (Grade 7 through Grade 12)

Various procedural aspects such as facilities, personnel, organization, and evaluation have been discussed in each of the descriptions.

Effective Project For Middle and Teen Years

(Town Classification A)

The role of an elementary school was modified to serve as a center for three schools during after school hours. School help was given and recreational programs were made available for elementary and junior high school students. An Arts and crafts area was opened; listening centers were equipped with record player and records; additional day time creative arts and music experiences were made available; modern dance was provided for girls and gymnastics for boys; story hours and books were available from the library; and trips were taken during the week and on Saturdays. Parents from the neighborhood were recruited to chaperone and serve as leaders.

Having attempted to make schools a more inviting place by its expansion through the project, priority services then focused on face-to-face help in studies. Children left their classes during the day to work with aides. Also, afternoon and Saturday appointments were kept by the same children and youth. Pupils who rarely had done their homework now did it under a

parent-substitute's watchful and helpful direction. Non-English speaking pupils were helped, particularly with vocabulary. Some children went on backyard cook-outs, traveled to shore spots, and visited games and exhibitions with the aides.

Rather than use standardized test efforts to evaluate short term services, the test results obtained in the first year have been collected to develop norms for project youth. An evaluation submitted by the town at the conclusion of the first school year presented ample evidence of progress.

Effective Project For Teen Years

(Town Classification A)

A summer basic education program was designed for 250 high school youth in cooperation with the Neighborhood Youth Corps. With the Youth Corps sponsoring the job opportunities, the high school offered basic skill help and guidance. The age level of the group ranged from 16 to 21 years. Initial achievement test scores showed reading, spelling, and arithmetic skills to be below grade level for the youth served.

Courses were offered in language, business machines, family, physical education, art and drama. Students chose from among four course offerings while two courses were required by all. Eight college student aides were selected to work with high school teachers. The staff felt that inter-personal relations and program acceptance was due in a large part to the selection of teachers and aides representative of the ethnic, racial, and

socio-economic make-up of the participants.

A student opinion survey at the close of the program indicated that 205 of the 250 youth served would like to see the program continued next year. Average weekly attendance was 223. Continuous employment with the Youth Corps was made contingent upon school attendance because it was felt that relating work to school enhanced job performance and gave greater meaning to the school course offerings.

Effective Program for Early Years

(Town Classification A)

Preschool opportunity for three to five year olds was increased in one city by the addition of three centers to sixteen previously established centers for early childhood education. Each center was equipped to handle 30 children in a 2½ hour morning or afternoon session four days weekly. Each center was staffed with teacher, aide, and baby attendants. Other staff included a coordinator, parent advisors, consultant, social worker, psychological examiner, and curriculum assistants.

Joint meetings of coordinating staff and kindergarten teachers and aides were held.

Parents of participants were invited to attend a two hour session weekly at the centers. Baby attendants were provided for the parents. Parent advisors sought parental support for the program and gave instruction in sewing and cooking. The social worker talked with parents about available welfare benefits.

This project which was originally funded for two previous years under another source will have a long range effectiveness assessment available for project children as well as non-project children during the 1966-67 school year.

Effective Project for Early and Middle Years

(Town Classification A)

A project aimed at improving school attitude and basic skills provided: (1) remedial reading and arithmetic, language help, and social work services for non-public youth; (2) remedial reading, language help, musical-dramatic-dance presentations in school, and ancillary personnel for youth at one public school, and (3) story hour sessions, reading help, and an outdoor education program for a second public school.

Seven of nine public school teachers endorsed the language help program component for recent immigrants as generally bettering their total school effort. The program had to be flexible and individualistic because new immigrants were coming into the program at a rapid rate. Also, a wide age range existed, and at least two other languages besides English were spoken. It was deemed essential that regular classroom teachers reinforce the English language usage taught in the program. For example, in the classroom, children were encouraged to answer questions in complete sentences. Community aides as part of the staff were judged important because of their language facility and partly because they were representative of the foreign born population.

Effective Program for Middle Years

(Town Classification A)

Teachers and principals from a core city's priority schools recommended public and non-public children for inclusion in a summer creative arts program. A total of 459 children participated in a variety of activities including vocal and instrumental music, painting, sculpturing, ceramic work, woodworking, swimming, trampoline instruction, expression in pantomime, puppetry, and dance. The setting was an abandoned amusement park of a public ocean beach.

The general attitude and behavior of the children was singled out as the most significant aspect of the program. Although equipment and objects of art were freely exposed, there were no instances of theft or willful destruction. A degree of skill in the creative arts offered was judged to have been attained by a majority of the participants.

The staff included teaching and supervisory personnel from the city, college students, and professional fine arts persons.

An overall attendance record of 89% indicated the degree of interest of participants. A questionnaire at the close of the program showed 91% of the children desiring to return for the program the following year.

Effective Program for Early Years

(Town Classification C)

Reading laboratory materials were used in primary educational clinics located in 4 elementary schools. Each of the town's clinics had a

teacher and a full-time teacher aide. A director, social worker, and psychological examiner were shared by the four clinics.

Clinical staff did diagnostic testing and worked directly with school youth for part of the school day. Homes were visited and parental suggestions elicited. An orientation period at the beginning involved principals, clinical staff, and consultants. Visitations were made by clinical staff to towns with comparable projects.

Teacher-made tests and anecdotal records were used mainly to assess progress made by project youth in the first year. Classroom teachers voiced an opinion that separate help programs should work more closely with classroom teachers.

Effective Program for Middle Years

(Town Classification C)

Understanding youth workers were provided for 60 middle grade youth of a suburban community to improve youths' attitudes toward the school, community, and toward one another.

Youth workers planned activities for after school hours, weekends, and in the summer. Typical activities included summer camping, basketball games, meals in community restaurants, and meetings with professional athletes. An important phase 1 activity after youth workers were hired was to become acquainted with the schools, meet the school personnel, and get well acquainted with community resources.

Extensive pretesting was completed for all children in the first year. Projective tests, achievement tests, anecdotal records, and teacher ratings were among the instruments used. A post-testing has been planned for project youth at the end of one full year.

Camping was described as the most successful experience. Youth workers have been able to form a complete impression of each child, and the youngsters in turn received a stimulating learning experience. The inclusion of non-project youth with healthy, confident attitudes added greatly to the learning experience of project youngsters.

Effective Preschool Thru High School Project

(Town Classification E)

State Project No. ___ Three small school districts combined their resources to make a more effective, efficient, and economical use of their Title I grants. A three phase program was designed for Grades 1 through 8. A thorough appraisal was made in phase 1; specific plans of aid followed in phase 2; and phase 3 envisioned an ongoing instructional clinic.

In the first year, 71 youth from the 3 town area were served...mostly a phase 1 operation. Teachers received training as developmental examiners, and consultative services were obtained.

Another component of the project was a plan for serving high school youth. A coordinator was appointed to study the high school youth identified, survey potential employment opportunities in the 3 town area, and to design a program of work experience coordinated with the high school program. In the first year, considerable time was spent in initial arrangements. Three important considerations have been: (1) thorough planning that preceded the actual programs, (2) opportunity

to schedule youths' regular school program so that blocks of time could be arranged for work experience, and (3) devising transportation on methods for the widely dispersed activities.

10. GENERAL ANAYLSIS OF TITLE I

As stated in the introduction of this report, limited time in which to implement Title I projects during fiscal year 1966 makes generalizing from these evaluative data a hazardous procedure. At the most, it is possible to use this information to detect emerging patterns being developed to provide compensatory instructional services to meet the needs of the deprived and to evaluate the mood of education toward these programs. Title I programs can be evaluated with a degree of precision and validity only after a reasonable period of time has elapsed. To do otherwise would be a disservice to the children and youth for whom these programs have been created and a serious threat to the welfare of all people. A social problem of this magnitude cannot be solved in a few weeks or months.

With a recognition of the limitations of the data provided by this report, the following statements seem appropriate:

1. Title I programs show promise of assisting deprived children and youth achieve the basic subject matter skills taught in school.

2. There is some recognition of the fact that deprived children and youth need programs directed at attitudes before meaningful progress in school can be achieved.

3. Statistics related to the numbers of deprived children and youth involved in Title I programs indicate that concern has been focused on a sizeable group of pupils in the public and non-public schools who might otherwise be neglected.

4. There is considerable evidence that teachers, administrators, and other persons associated with our schools feel that progress is being made in improving the educational opportunities of deprived children and youth. (See Table 2, Part III)

PART III - TABLE 1

Measuring Instrument Choice For Types of Title I Programs

TYPES OF PROGRAMS	READING					BASIC SKILLS					ARITHMETIC					ATTITUDINAL AND BEHAVIORAL				
Grade Span*	PreK Kind	Gr. 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	PreK Kind	Gr. 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	PreK Kind	Gr. 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	PreK Kind	Gr. 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
Measures																				
1. Stand. Tests																				
a. Achievement		8	15	6			2	4	2				2	1						
b. Intelligence																				
c. Aptitude																				
d. Interest																				
e. Attitude																				
f. Reading Inventories			2																	
2. Other Tests																				
a. Locally Devised Tests		1		1																
b. Teacher Made Tests		2	1					2				1	2							
c. Proj. Tech.																	2	1		
3.Other Meas.																				
a. Teacher Ratings		3					2	2	3				1				1	2	1	
b. Anecdotal Records		1					1											1		
c. Observer							1											1		
d. Sub. Judg.		1	2				1	2	1	1		1	1	1			5	1	2	1
e. Student Eval.							1	1	1											
TOTALS		16	20	7			8	11	7	1		2	6	2			8	6	3	1

*Many programs extend over the grade spans of categories given; therefore, the grade spans serving the largest number of project youth have been designated.

PART III - TABLE 2

Effectiveness of Types of Title I Projects

School Level*	PreK &K	Grades 1-3	Grades 4-6	Grades 7-9	Grades 10-12	Totals
1. Reading, Language Arts and Oral Language Programs						
Substantial Progress Achieved		3	6	2		11
Some Progress Achieved		15	10	6		31
Little or no Progress Achieved			1			1
2. Basic Skill Help or Tutoring Programs						
Substantial Progress Achieved			5	1		6
Some Progress Achieved		4	10	5		19
Little or no Progress Achieved		1		1		2
3. Preschool Programs						
Substantial Progress Achieved	4					4
Some Progress Achieved	9					9
Little or no Progress Achieved						

* Many projects extended beyond the grade spans of categories given; therefore, the grade spans serving the largest number of project youth have been designated.

PART III - TABLE 2

Effectiveness of Types of Title I Projects

School Level	PreK & K	Grades 1-3	Grades 4-6	Grades 7-9	Grades 10-12	Totals
4. Creative Arts (Music, Art, drama, or combinations) Programs						
Substantial Progress Achieved		2	2	1		5
Some Progress Achieved		1	5	2		8
Little or no Progress Achieved						
5. Language Help Programs for Non-English Speaking Pupils						
Substantial Progress Achieved	1		1			2
Some Progress Achieved	1	3	3	1		8
Little or no Progress Achieved						
6. Arithmetic Programs						
Substantial Progress Achieved	1	1				2
Some Progress Achieved	4	3	1			8
Little or no Progress Achieved						

PART III - TABLE 2

Effectiveness of Types of Title I Projects

School Level	Pre K & K	Grades 1-3	Grades 4-6	Grades 7-9	Grades 10-12	Totals
7. Programs to Increase the School's Holding Power						
Substantial Progress Achieved				1	2	3
Some Progress Achieved				3	4	7
Little or no Progress Achieved						
8. Other (Counseling, trip centered, ancillary, library, science.)						
Substantial Progress Achieved			1	1		2
Some Progress Achieved		4	3	2	1	10
Little or no Progress Achieved						

PART III - TABLE 3

Average Daily Attendance and Average Daily Membership Rates For Title I Project Schools Compared With State Norms

Average daily attendance and average daily membership data for Title I schools were not collected during fiscal year 1966. However, these data will be provided for Title I schools for succeeding fiscal years.

PART III - TABLES 4 and 5

Dropout Rates (Holding Power) for Title I Project Schools Compared with Non Title I Schools

Data concerning dropout rates for Title I schools and non Title I schools have not been provided in the form and for the years requested in "State Annual Evaluation Report for Previous Fiscal Year."

Beginning with the fiscal year 1967, the pupil accounting system in Connecticut will be changed to conform with practices established in "Handbook V, Pupil Accounting for Local and State School Systems." Data that could be obtained from Connecticut School Registers concerning withdrawals for fiscal years previous to 1967 do not clearly distinguish between dropouts and other types of withdrawals. For this reason, the Connecticut State Department of Education communicated with U.S. Office staff our intention of collecting dropout data in a different way for fiscal year 1966.

The Connecticut format for reporting "Annual Evaluation of ESEA

Title I Projects" requested the following (when applicable): (a) List the number of youth served by the project who withdrew from school upon reaching their 16th birthday during the school year of 1965-66. (b) List the number of youth directly served by the project who continued in school upon reaching their 16th birthday during the 1965-66 school year.

All responses to the questions for projects serving youth in grades 7 and above were totaled. The number of project youth served in grades 7 through 12 were totaled. Also, comparative data were drawn from composite "End of Year School Reports (4-66)" for the same towns for which grades 7-12 dropout figures had been obtained. The following specific data were used from End of Year School Reports":

(1) W5 (Pupils left school after becoming sixteen) for grades 7-12

(2) E1 & E2 (original entries) for grades 7-12

Dropout data and rates have been presented in the tables below:

Project Youth Withdrawing and Continuing After Reaching Age 16

Number of Projects Serving Youth in Grade 7 or Above	Number of Projects Serving Youth in Grades 7 or above Reporting Dropout Data	Total Number of Project youth withdrawing from School after becoming sixteen years of age	Total Number of Project youth who continued in School upon reaching their sixteenth birthday
76	25	84	313

Of the 25 projects serving youth in grades 7 or above, comparative town data were available for 16 of the towns. The table below compares the total project youth dropout rate with the total town-wide school dropout rate.

A	B	C	D
No. of project youth withdrawing after becoming 16	No. of project youth served in grades 7-12	No. of all school youth withdrawing at age 16	No. of all school youth in grades 7-12
70	1332	854	50,425
A÷B x 100 = % of dropout = 5%		C÷D x 100 = % of dropout = 2%	

When dropout data are excluded for one project in the preceding tables, a total of 15 projects give decidedly different results.

Recomputed Project Youth Dropout Rate Compared With The Town-Wide Dropout Rate

A	B	C	D
No. of project youth withdrawing after becoming 16	No. of project youth served in grades 7-12	No. of all school youth withdrawing at age 16	No. of all school youth in grades 7-12
19	932	677	40,485
A ÷ B x 100 = % of dropout = 2%		C ÷ D x 100 = % of dropout = 2%	

PART III - TABLE 6

Percentage of Students in Title I Project High Schools Continuing Education Beyond High School Compared With State Norm

In view of the small number of Connecticut projects (7) involving 12th grade pupils it was not possible to draw comparisons relating post-secondary education to a statewide norm. However, from the 7 projects reporting the involvement of 12th grade pupils, the following information was secured concerning post-secondary education.

1. Of the 149 seniors served by these 7 projects, 68 had taken action to continue their education beyond the 12th grade.

2. One project was specifically directed at encouraging deprived youth with some potential to continue their education after graduation from high school. This project was directed at 74 identified 12th grade pupils. Of these 74 seniors, 61 took positive action to continue their education.

PART III - TABLE 7

Results For Most Wideley Used Tests In Skill Subjects For Title I Schools

The data required to complete this table have been impossible to secure from fiscal year 1966 projects. Connecticut does not have a

statewide testing program and the computation of standard deviations or percentile norms for approximately 30 different standarized tests with several different forms is a long-term task.

To secure results of standardized tests used in the evaluation of Title I projects, attention is directed to Item 10c, Part I of this project.

PART III - TABULAR DATA 8

A. Given below, in rank order, are the five most prevalent objectives of Connecticut Title I projects:

1. Improve Reading Skills
2. Improve Basic Subject Skills
3. Provide for Creative Expression
4. Improve Kindergarten or First Grade Readiness
5. Improve Language Skills of Non-English Speaking Youth

B. The most common approaches used to reach the objectives given in A, are:

Improve Reading Skills

1. Additional Teacher Time
2. Equipment and Supplies

Improve Basic Skill Subjects

1. Additional Teacher Time
2. Equipment and Supplies
3. Teacher Aides
4. Special Tutors

Provide for Creative Expression

1. Outdoor Summer Program
2. Additional Teacher Time
3. Trips

Improve Kindergarten or First Grade Readiness

1. Additional Teacher Time
2. Teacher Aides
3. Facilities

Improve Language Skills of Non-English Speaking Youth

1. Additional Teacher Time
2. Teacher Aides

FINDINGS RELATED TO PART III TABLES

To summarize the information presented by Part III Tables, the findings listed on the following page are presented:

1. More than 50% of the Title I reading projects used standarized achievement tests as a measuring instrument.

2. The major measuring instruments used to evaluate Title I projects involving instruction in the general area of basic skills were: Achievement tests (30%), Teacher ratings (25%), and Subjective Judgment (20%),

3. The major instruments used to evaluate Title I projects dealing with arithmetic instruction were: Achievement tests (30%), Teacher-made tests (30%), and Subjective judgment (30%).

4. Fifty percent (50%) of the Title I projects directed at attitudinal and behavioral programs used subjective judgments as the measuring instrument.

5. Of the 161 Title I projects initiated in Connecticut during fiscal year 1966, 138 provided direct instruction or services for children and youth. Twenty-three (23) Title I projects in Connecticut were directed toward preparation for serving children and youth in the second year of operation.

6. Evaluations of Title I projects related to language achievement (Reading, language arts, and oral language) showed the following:

   a. Substantial Progress - 25%
   b. Some Progress - 73%
   c. Little or No Progress - 2%

7. Evaluation of Title I projects related to the general area of basic skills instruction showed the following:

   a. Substantial Progress - 20%
   b. Some Progress - 73%
   c. Little or No Progress 7%

8. Evaluation of Title I projects related to preschool programs showed the following:

   a. Substantial Progress - 33%
   b. Some Progress - 67%
   c. Little or No Progress - 0%

9. Evaluation of Title I projects related to creative arts instruction showed the following:

   a. Substantial Progress - 38%
   b. Some Progress - 62%
   c. Little or No Progress - 0%

10. Evaluation of Title I projects related to language help to Non-English speaking children and youth showed the following:

   a. Substantial Progress - 20%
   b. Some Progress - 80%
   c. Little or No Progress - 0%

11. Evaluation of Title I projects related to arithmetic instruction showed the following:

   a. Substantial Progress - 20%
   b. Some Progress - 80%
   c. Little or No Progress - 0%

12. Evaluation of Title I projects related to programs designed to increase the schools holding power showed the following:

   a. Substantial Progress - 30%
   b. Some Progress - 70%
   c. Little or No Progress - 0%

13. Dropout statistics show that 2% of the youth being served by Title I projects withdrew from school during fiscal year 1966. This dropout rate is consistent with the statistics concerning school withdrawal for the entire school district from which these dropout data were secured. This is an encouraging sign as deprived youth tend to drop out of school much more frequently than their peers being educated in more affluent areas of a school district.

Interpretation of Findings Related to Part III Tables

The following is an interpretation of the findings secured from the information presented by Part III Tables:

1. During fiscal year 1966, the school districts of Connecticut used standardized tests as the major means of evaluating Title I projects providing instruction in the subject matter areas. In addition, teacher ratings and subjective judgments were frequently used to evaluate projects dealing with subject matter instruction.

2. For the evaluation of projects dealing with attitudinal or behavioral programs the school districts of Connecticut used subjective judgments as the major measuring device.

3. The vast majority of Title I projects were evaluated as making progress toward the objectives stated in project proposals. Many evaluations indicated that substantial progress had been made in reaching the objectives of programs established for deprived children and youth.